



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/401,875	09/23/1999	ABRAHAM I. ZEIGLER	09857/023001	5266
26161	7590	11/17/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			CAMPEN, KELLY SCAGGS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/401,875	ZEIGLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kelly Campen	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on August 13, 2004, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed method consists solely of the manipulation of an abstract idea and is not concrete or tangible. See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 1994). See also *Schrader*, 22 F.3d at 295, 30 USPQ2d at 1459. In addition, the claim is devoid of any limitation to a practical application in the technological arts. The

invention in the body of the claim must recite technology. If the invention, in the body of the claim, is not tied to technological art, environment, or machine, the claim is not statutory (see *Ex parte Bowman*, 61 USPQ2d 1665, 1671 (BD. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001). Also note MPEP 2106 IV 2(b). Examiner notes that this is not a precedential decision but it is being cited for its analysis of whether the claim is in the technological arts.

As to claims 18-19, the claims appear to be directed towards a client station but do not include any more than descriptions of a quote and no tie to the technological art. As to claims 20-23, the claims appear to be directed towards a graphical user interface but again appear to merely describe quotes.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically as to claim 1, the claim is incomplete. The preamble is directed to a method of trading securities yet there are no trading steps. Additionally, the claim is indefinite.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "additional aggregates" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "the reserve quote" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "additional...reserve quotes" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the order" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Specifically as to claim 13, it is unclear "for a server process that...aggregates quotes and causes aggregate quotes" the metes and bounds of the claim are unclear.

Specifically as to claims 14 and 15, the claim is indefinite and vague as to what is really being claimed.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the electronic system" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The term "can be" in claim 17 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "can be" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Specifically as to claims 18, 20 and 24, the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be defined; therefore, the claim is indefinite. Specifically, is the applicant claiming a "client station" or a method of entering quotes? Lines 2-3 appear to refer to what function the station is capable of performing and then followed by lines 4-7 which appear to be describing the quotes. Is applicant claiming the combination/subcombination? Applicant should correct and clarify.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "the aggregation" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "the system" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Guttermann et al. (WO 91/14231).

Specifically as to claim 1, Guttermann et al. disclose a method of trading securities, see abstract.

Specifically as to claims 2-12, see above rejection for claim 1, in addition, see pages 14-29.

Specifically as to claim 13, Guttermann et al. disclose an electronic market comprising a plurality of client stations and a server process, see abstract and pages 14-29 and pages 1-11.

Specifically as to claims 14-17, see above rejection for claim 13.

Specifically as to claim 18, Guttermann et al. disclose a client station comprising a graphical user interface, see abstract and pages 1-11.

Specifically as to claim 19, see above rejection for claim 18.

Specifically as to claim 20, Guttermann et al. disclose a graphical user interface with an aggregation window, see abstract and pages 1-11.

Specifically as to claims 21-23, see above rejection for claim 20.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelly Campen whose telephone number is (703) 308-0780. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (703) 308-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kelly S. Campen



VINCENT MILLIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

VINCENT MILLIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600